



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,555	07/16/2004	Bo Johan Niklas Niklasson	10400-000111/US	5132
30593	7590	08/09/2007	EXAMINER	
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			APANIUS, MICHAEL	
P.O. BOX 8910			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
RESTON, VA 20195			3736	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/501,555	NIKLASSON, BO JOHAN NIKLAS
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael Apanius	3736

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 July 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

 | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/4/2007 has been entered. The amendments to claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 11-13, 15 and 18-20 are acknowledged.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: "25" and "29" in at least figures 2 and 4. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If

Art Unit: 3736

the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because the specification does not contain any of the usual headings (i.e. "Background of the invention", "Brief summary of the invention", etc.). Appropriate correction is required. See MPEP 608.01(a)

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1-17 are objected to because of the following informalities:
- a. At claim 1, line 4, it appears that "number" should be --plurality--.
 - b. At claim 1, line 6, it appears that "each" should be --each test chamber--.
 - c. At claim 1, line 10, it appears that "its" should be changed to specifically recite an element.
 - d. At claim 13, the recitations of "rim portions" appear to lack proper antecedent basis in the claim.
 - e. At claim 14, line 2, it appears that "its" should not be recited in the claim because a specific element is not recited.
 - f. It appears that claim 17 is essentially a copy of claim 4. Although claim 17, recites "a medical adhesive", it appears that "medical" should be deleted to correspond to the amendment to claim 1.

Art Unit: 3736

g. At claim 19, line 4, it appears that "cell" should be --chamber--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 11, 15 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anhäuser et al. (US 5,044,372) in view of Augustine et al. (US 6,143,945).

7. Anhäuser discloses an epicutaneous test plaster, comprising: a flexible carrier (12) including an adhesive layer (13) for removably adhesion of the epicutaneous test plaster to a skin portion; a number of test chambers (around 14) distributed over the adhesive layer of the carrier; a removable cover layer (16) extending over all the test chambers and the carrier, wherein the test chambers are formed as separate chambers, each including, a support element (14) secured to the carrier and including a support layer adhered to a moisture barrier layer (column 5, line 30), a frame-shaped foam plastic layer (15) secured on top of and embracing the support element, and wherein the cover layer is removably secured by way of the adhesive layer of the carrier. In regards to claim 11, each support element is secured to the carrier by way of an adhesive layer, whose one side is fixed to the carrier and whose other side is fixed to

the support element. In regards to claim 15, each frame-shaped foam plastic layer is secured to the support element by way of an adhesive layer, whose one side is fixed to the foam plastic layer and whose other side is fixed to the support element.

8. However, Anhäuser does not expressly disclose that a layer of adhesive is on the outwardly directed side of the frame-shaped foam plastic layer.

9. Augustine teaches a layer of adhesive (28) on an outwardly directed side of a frame-shaped plastic layer (24) for the purpose of creating a closed, fluid impermeable chamber (column 3, lines 13-16). The adhesive layer is for attaching the plastic layer to a test area. The adhesive layer extends all the way around the perimeter of a chamber and has an opening through which an interior of the chamber is exposed (see figure 1A).

10. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have used a layer of adhesive as taught by Augustine on the outwardly directed side of the frame-shaped foam plastic layer of Anhäuser in order to achieve the predictable result of creating a closed, fluid impermeable chamber.

11. Claims 2-4, 17 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anhäuser et al. (US 5,044,372) as modified by Augustine et al. (US 6,143,945), as applied to claims 1, 11, 15 and 18-20 above, and further in view of Rüdiger et al. (US 4,887,611).

12. Anhäuser as modified by Augustine does not expressly disclose that the cover layer is a plastic layer with blister bubbles.

Art Unit: 3736

13. Rüdiger teaches a plastic cover layer (column 3, lines 44-47) with blister bubbles (20), which enclose test chambers. The blister bubbles have a groove (see above 19 in figure 3) in contact with a rim of the test sites. The cover layer of Rüdiger improves handling, storage and transport of the plaster (column 3, lines 39-49).

14. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have used a cover layer with blister bubbles as taught by Rüdiger in the plaster of Anhäuser as modified by Augustine in order to improve handling, storage and transport of the plaster.

15. In regards to claim 3, Rüdiger discloses that the cover layer has a polypropylene layer but does not expressly disclose that the cover layer has a polyethylene layer. However, Rüdiger states that the cover layer should be coated with an inert material (column 3, lines 45-46). Rüdiger further teaches that polypropylene and polyethylene are alternative inert plastics (column 2, lines 44-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have substituted the polypropylene on the cover layer with polyethylene because the substitution would have yielded predictable results and because Rüdiger teaches that these two materials are alternative inert plastics.

16. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anhäuser et al. (US 5,044,372) as modified by Augustine et al. (US 6,143,945), as applied to claims 1, 11, 15 and 18-20 above, and further in view of Quisno (US 4,450,844).

17. Even though Anhäuser states that various materials can be used (column 3, lines 26-31), including treated papers, Anhäuser as modified by Augustine does not expressly disclose that the cover layer is a paper liner with a silicone layer that faces the test chambers.

18. Quisno teaches a paper cover liner with a silicone layer that faces test areas (column 4, lines 33-37).

19. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have substituted the paper liner taught by Quisno for the cover layer of Anhäuser as modified by Augustine because the substitution would have yielded predictable results such as protecting the adhesive until use.

20. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anhäuser et al. (US 5,044,372) as modified by Augustine et al. (US 6,143,945), as applied to claims 1, 11, 15 and 18-20 above, and further in view of Hoffmann (US RE37,934).

21. Although Anhäuser discloses a flexible porous surgical tape, Anhäuser as modified by Augustine does not expressly disclose a methacrylate-based adhesive layer.

22. Hoffmann teaches a methacrylate-based adhesive layer (column 7, lines 13-26) for fixing a plaster to the skin.

23. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have substituted the methacrylate-based adhesive as taught by

Hoffmann for the adhesive of Anhäuser as modified by Augustine to achieve the predictable result of adhering a plaster to skin.

24. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anhäuser et al. (US 5,044,372) as modified by Augustine et al. (US 6,143,945), as applied to claims 1, 11, 15 and 18-20 above, and further in view of Breneman (US 4,543,964).

25. Anhäuser as modified by Augustine teaches using a cotton support element (column 5, line 29), but does not expressly disclose that the support element is cellulose-based.

26. Breneman teaches that cotton and methyl cellulose are known alternative absorbent materials for use in a test plaster (column 4, lines 15-20).

27. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have substituted a cellulose-based material as taught by Breneman for the cotton of Anhäuser as modified by Augustine to achieve the predictable result of providing an absorbent material to hold a test substance.

28. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anhäuser et al. (US 5,044,372) as modified by Augustine et al. (US 6,143,945), as applied to claims 1, 11, 15 and 18-20 above, and further in view of van der Bend (NL 8701577).

29. Anhäuser as modified by Augustine does not expressly disclose that the frame-shaped foam plastic layer consists of a polyethylene foam.

30. van der Bend teaches making a frame-shaped foam plastic layer out of a polyethylene foam (see translation submitted by Applicant).
31. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have used a polyethylene foam as taught by van der Bend in the frame-shaped foam plastic layer of Anhäuser as modified by Augustine because it is well-known and routine in the art to substitute alternative materials to yield predictable results.
32. Claims 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anhäuser et al. (US 5,044,372) as modified by Augustine et al. (US 6,143,945), as applied to claims 1, 11, 15 and 18-20 above, and further in view of Pluim, Jr. (US 4,472,507).
33. In regards to claim 13, the frame-shaped foam fixing layer of Anhäuser extends outside the rim portions of the support element. Anhäuser as modified by Augustine does not expressly disclose that the support element is secured to the carrier by a flexible double-adhesive tape or that the frame-shaped foam plastic layer is secured to the support element by a flexible double-adhesive tape.
34. Pluim teaches the use of a flexible double-adhesive tape for use in adhering layers of a carrier together (column 3, lines 17-21).
35. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have used a flexible double-adhesive tape as taught by Pluim in

the plaster of Anhäuser as modified by Augustine to achieve the predictable result of adhering layers together.

36. Claims 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anhäuser et al. (US 5,044,372) as modified by Augustine et al. (US 6,143,945) and Pluim, Jr. (US 4,472,507), as applied to claims 9, 12 and 13 above, and further in view of Kurokawa et al. (US 4,158,359).

37. Anhäuser as modified by Augustine and Pluim does not expressly disclose using a synthetic rubber-based adhesive on the double-adhesive tape.

38. Kurokawa teaches that synthetic rubber is a known pressure-sensitive adhesive that has no influence on human skin (column 5, lines 33-38).

39. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have used a synthetic rubber-based adhesive as taught by Kurokawa in the plaster of Anhäuser as modified by Augustine and Pluim to achieve the predictable result of adhering layers together with no influence on human skin.

40. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anhäuser et al. (US 5,044,372) as modified by Augustine et al. (US 6,143,945), as applied to claims 1, 11, 15 and 18-20 above, and further in view of Kraft et al. (US 4,809,707).

41. Anhäuser as modified by Augustine does not expressly disclose that the frame-shaped foam plastic layer is a flexible double-adhesive tape.

Art Unit: 3736

42. Kraft teaches a flexible double-adhesive tape (46) surrounding a support element for the purpose of affixing the support element to a patient (column 4, lines 12-14).

43. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have made the frame-shaped foam plastic layer of Anhäuser as modified by Augustine out of double-adhesive tape as taught by Kraft to achieve the predictable result of affixing a support element to a patient.

Response to Arguments

44. Applicant's arguments with respect to the previous prior art rejections have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

45. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Apanius whose telephone number is (571) 272-5537. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8am-4:30pm.

46. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on (571) 272-4726. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

47. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MA



MAX E. HINDENBURG
EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700